

Illinois U Library Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by 278 Stations of the ABC Network



U. S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

How Can We Fight Corruption in Government?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

PAUL H. DOUGLAS

ALEXANDER WILEY



THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

on

"Will Life Be Better in 1952?"

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 36, N. Y.

VOLUME 17, NUMBER 37  \$5.00 A YEAR, 15c A COPY



Town Meeting

VOL. 17

No. 37



How Can We Fight Corruption in Government?



The Broadcast of January 8, 1952, from 9:00 to 9:45 p.m., EST, over the American Broadcasting Company Network, originated from Beth Tfiloh Synagogue, under auspices of Beth Tfiloh Congregation Forum, Baltimore, Maryland.



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recording made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of views presented.

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS—Democrat of Illinois; member of Senate Banking and Currency Committee and Labor and Public Welfare Committee. After graduation from Bowdoin College in 1913, Senator Douglas did graduate work at Columbia University, where he earned his Ph.D. He has been a member of the faculty of the University of Chicago since 1920. He became a professor of economics in 1925. In 1942, at the age of 50, Senator Douglas enlisted in the Marine Corps. He was sent to the South Pacific in 1943 and rose through the ranks to the grade of Lieutenant Colonel. Mr. Douglas was elected to the Senate in November, 1948. He is an internationally known economist, and author of many books, including *The Theory of Wages* and *Real Wages in the United States*.

SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY—Republican of Wisconsin; member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a special committee to Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce (Kefauver Committee), and former member of the Judiciary Committee. Born in Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin, in 1884, Senator Wiley attended Augsburg College in Minneapolis, the University of Michigan Law School, and received a degree in law from the University of Wisconsin. Entering the practice of law in Chippewa Falls, he also operated a dairy farm, became director of a bank, served on the local school board, and was active in local business and civic affairs. From 1909 to 1915, he was district attorney for Chippewa County, and in November, 1938, was elected to the United States Senate. He was reelected in 1950 for the current term. Senator Wiley is the author of a humorous book, *Laughing With Congress*, and has also written a column of Washington news for many Wisconsin weekly newspapers.

Town Meeting is published weekly at 32 S. Fourth St., Columbus 15, Ohio, by The Town Hall, Inc., New York 36, New York. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 36, N.Y.

Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, (Canada, \$6.00); six months, \$3.00, (Canada, \$3.50); eight weeks, \$1.00, (Canada, \$1.20); 15c a single copy. Entered as second-class matter May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Copyright, 1952, BY THE TOWN HALL, INC.

How Can We Fight Corruption in Government?

Announcer:

Tonight your Town Meeting originates for the second successive year from the Beth Tfiloh Synagogue on Garrison Boulevard in Baltimore. The program is a feature of the Beth Tfiloh Forum Series, which for the past seven years has brought outstanding speakers and events to Baltimore as a community service. We salute the Beth Tfiloh Forum Committee for its civic initiative in bringing informative and thought-provoking discussions to its members, and for contributing so much to a better understanding of today's critical problems.

Town Meeting is always happy to coöperate with local forum groups throughout the country, and we are planning many broadcasts in connection with community discussions and lecture organizations during the coming year. For information about tour originations, write to Town Meeting, New York 36, New York. Now to preside over our discussion, here is your moderator, the founder of America's Town Meeting, George V. Denny, Jr.

Moderator Denny:

(Good evening, neighbors. We're delighted to be back with our friends of the Beth Tfiloh Congregation Forum here in Baltimore and know that you will keep our excellent speakers on their mettle during the question period tonight. An old Greek proverb reads, "The strength of a city is in the virtue of its citizens." Well, the Greeks knew and you and I know today that corruption and public apathy are more dangerous to the stability of government than rioters and conspirators. We can

execute, banish, or imprison the latter, but the former are diseases of the blood stream that weaken and destroy the body politic.

We therefore call to our platform two of our ablest political doctors, representing our two major political parties, to consult with us tonight on this question: Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat of Illinois, member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and Labor and Public Welfare Committees; and Senator Alexander Wiley, Republican of Wisconsin, former Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and now its ranking minority member, who also served as a member of the Kefauver Committee investigating organized crime in this country.

We'll hear first from the Senator from Illinois, Senator Paul H. Douglas.

Senator Douglas:

Mr. Denny, Senator Wiley, and friends, the country has been shocked in this last year by the revelations that important administrative officials have put themselves under obligation to private persons dealing with the Government by accepting from them valuable gifts ranging up to natural royal pastel mink coats, and also accepting expensive entertainment which has included free airplane trips, trips to the Kentucky Derby, and sojourns in luxury hotels in Miami and New York.

The country has not liked the way in which men in government have frequently given valuable privileges to corporations and have then resigned to accept high-paid positions in these same com-

panies. The public has been shocked at the spectacle of many men using their official positions to get more business for their private ventures.

There has been solid ground for suspicion that in all too many cases improper loans have been granted by the R. F. C., improper tax favors given to those with influence by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the procurement officials in the Armed Services have been unpardonably lax in awarding contracts and making purchases.

Thus far, not many cases, if any, of open bribery have been revealed. Apparently open bribery, which was practiced in the Teapot Dome and Elk, Ill., cases has become somewhat passé. What happens instead is frequently for men in office to accept gifts and favors from those doing business with government and then to do favors for them at the public expense in return and to claim that these acts have no relationship to each other and are disassociated.

May the clean-up which has started continue with the coöperation of both parties. The guilty should be exposed and dropped from office, and those who have enticed or corrupted them should be deprived of rights and privileges, such as contracts, and so forth, which they now possess. All this is necessary, but I do not think that we will effect any very great permanent improvement unless we also take the following three steps.

First, in my judgment we should pass and enforce a Code of Ethical Proprieties, something less than a criminal sentence, under which a public official who accepts valuable gifts and expensive entertainment from a person with whom

he directly or indirectly deals as a public servant would be dismissed from office, and also that the privileges of the entrapper or seducer he revoked the same time.

Under this same heading of Code of Ethical Proprieties, we should forbid an official from using his office to filter his private business, while officials who have come into government from private concerns, and there are thousands of such now, should disqualify themselves for at least two years from passing on cases involving their former employers.

The second step which, in my judgment, we should adopt was suggested from the floor in the question period preceding the forum. I believe we should institute and place into effect some limit on the total amounts which can be spent for a candidate or party and to have these costs more democratically shared.

Elections now are costing enormous amounts of money, and that amount is increasing with the advent of television. This makes candidates and parties dependent upon big contributors for funds. Most of these big contributors want favors at the public's expense after an election, so the public now pays ten times over for the financing of our political campaigns. In my judgment, we should place a limit upon total amount spent, not merely by a candidate or by a party, but for a candidate and for a party, and thus reduce the Independent committees which now handle most of the funds.

We should all take seriously the necessity of financing individually the candidates and parties of our choice, and I think that radio and television companies should as a matter a public co-

venience make more time available either at no cost at all or at nominal costs.

A third reform which we should institute is to require all Senators, congressmen, and policy-making government officials who received \$10,000 a year or above to file an annual statement of their total income and its sources. This would be a deterrent against wrongdoing, because there is nothing as disinfecting as sunlight.

I think it would also reassure the public since I am confident that there is less dishonesty in public life than people now believe. *(Applause)*

Moderator Denny:

Senator Douglas, I should say at this point that Town Meeting has asked the presidential candidates to appear on its program ever since it was founded in 1935, and we've offered them free time, and expect to continue to do it, and they will just get on the same program the same night over the same network and discuss similar issues and answer questions from the American people. It will cost them nothing.

Now, Senator Douglas, we thank you and we want to hear now from Senator Alexander Wiley, Republican of Wisconsin.

Senator Wiley:

Mr. Denny, and friends of Baltimore. There was a question asked, and I want to answer it. By sinners and sinners, we mean, of course, the evils that have been cited, but also other things: One, gangsterism; two, corrupt big-city political machines; three, we refer to improper influence by anyone in government—legislative, administrative, judicial.

Now this over-all problem really

boils down to three questions. How do you get the wrong type out of government? Two, how do you get the right type of man into government? Three, how to keep the right type of man right and good while he is in government? To do this requires both general and specific means. By general means, I refer to a change in people's attitude toward government office. By specific means, I refer to various specific weapons.

Now, first of all, there must be a recognition by all citizens, as was mentioned here tonight, that public office is a public trust and not an opportunity for personal gain or graft.

Second, they must recognize that the power to appoint other individuals to government, the power to appoint, like the governor here, is a public trust. No one must be appointed to any post in government unless his or her background as to character, integrity, ability, and devotion to public service has been thoroughly satisfied.

Third, let there be a realization in our consciousness of the old Mosaic Command, "Thou Shalt Not Steal." Let us realize moreover that it's a function, also a correlative function, "Thou Shalt not allow others to steal," whether they be in government employ or private connection.

Fourth, every private citizen must recognize that it is as wrong to offer a bribe or to seek to purchase influence as it is for a public official to accept a bribe or to sell influence.

Now as Senator Douglas has said, there must be a moral rebirth on the part of every American. That calls for combined action by the home, by the church,

by the school. Abe Lincoln said, "Beware of the menace within."

Now as to specific means: first, I believe that the disease of corruption must be coped with by tightening and really enforcing the penalty procedures against wrong-doers—enforcing them. Tonight you were asked whose job was it, and by and large the majority of you said it's the job of the party in power, of course.

Two, another specific weapon is to overcome partisan opposition and to re-establish the Senate Crime Investigating Committee as a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee.

Three, the corrupting big-city political machines with their gangland allies must be smashed at the gang roots by an aroused citizenry. You can't pass the buck to Washington—it's up to you people.

Four, decent pay for public employees.

Five, merit appointments through Civil Service rather than political patronage for key positions.

Six, The American Press should redouble its great efforts to expose crime and corruption.

Seven, the American pulpit must further arouse its flocks to the responsibilities of citizenship. We want to keep America. To sum up, what is basically needed is not so much mere mechanical devices or more laws or more organizations. What is needed is a re-dedication on the part of every American to the highest concept of public service and loyalty to his country. Thank you. (*Applause*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Wiley. As you see, both senators tonight are against sin and against sinners, if they are not Democrats or Re-

publicans. Gentlemen, is this going to be a love feast, or do you have some questions for each other? Senator Douglas, do you have any comments on Senator Wiley's speech? Do you want to ask him a question?

Senator Douglas: Well, I can't disagree with the very ethical precepts that Senator Wiley laid down. I would like to ask him whether he thinks we should put a limit upon total amounts spent in campaigns, and whether there is some way of getting the cost more democratically shared?

Senator Wiley: Well, of course we have put limits—we have got limits, but we don't enforce them so the problem is one of enforcement.

Senator Douglas: Well, we have a limit saying that a candidate for the United States Senate cannot spend more than \$25,000, but there is no limit placed on the amount which Independent committees can spend for their candidate; and in a recent election in Ohio, one of the candidates admitted that his Independent committee spent \$612,000. It's quite possible that he didn't get the entire count of all the Independent committees.

Now what I'm saying is, should we not get a maximum limit on the total amounts which should be spent for a candidate or for a party and not merely officially by that candidate or by that party? That will require total reporting by everyone.

Senator Wiley: I'm very happy to comment on that. In my own state last fall, all I could personally spend was \$5,000—that's fixed by law—and that's what I spent. Citizens did get together, as you understand, subsequently and spent some \$20-odd thousand. That wouldn't even be one penny stam-

for the people or the electorate in my state. When you talk about money that is spent, you must go deeper than that. You must ascertain what it's spent for. You must see whether there is any criminology in it.

In Ohio, there are probably eight, nine, million people. Six hundred thousand dollars spent for publicity is a drop in the bucket. I'm personally not in favor of doing anything that would have a tendency to corrupt the voter but I am not in favor of curbing the honest man from exercising his judgment or even spending his money to get what he thinks is the right candidate into office. Otherwise great organizations can send out people and utilize their efforts so that you will have no money spent, but they can control by their activity the election of the electorate.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Wiley. Senator Douglas wants to comment on that.

Senator Douglas: Well, I wasn't saying that any money was improperly spent in Ohio. You could certainly spend \$612,000 or possibly a million dollars perfectly honestly without buying any votes. What I am trying to point out is that when elections cost this enormous amount of money, candidates have to get the money from somewhere.

The average run of the voters will not contribute any such amount as that. The money has to be raised from the big-money boys and from the big contributors, and generally after election they come around and want favors and legislation in return; and if we're going to free our Senators, our congressmen, our elected officials from our parties from the big contributors, we've got to get some

way of limiting the total amount and having that amount more evenly shared. (*Applause*)

Senator Wiley: I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that there is already a limit on what a man can contribute—a federal limit of \$5,000 as a I understand it. I'm in favor of cutting that, if necessary. I'm in favor of doing what one of the gentlemen said out here today, and that is to get the individual citizens so interested in his government that he'll fight for the principles that he stands for and even pay a dollar into his party so that it will have funds to do the necessary work in a campaign. (*Applause*)

Senator Douglas: Well, that \$5,000 limit is perfectly ineffective because it's a \$5,000 limit to any one committee. You can give \$5,000 to the candidate, \$5,000 to the campaign committee, \$5,000 to the women's committee, \$5,000 to the labor committee, \$5,000 to the farmer's committee, \$5,000 to Czecho-Slovak Committee, \$5,000 to this, \$5,000 to that, and it still operates. What I want is a global total—a limit on the total amounts.

Mr. Denny: All right, thank you. Now, gentlemen, we have your opinion on that. Senator Wiley, have you a question for Senator Douglas, or shall we start with the question period?

Senator Wiley: Well, I'll just comment that as far as I'm personally concerned, I think we'll find that most of the ambassadors that have been appointed recently of late have given those \$5,000 in big bunches to the Democratic Campaign Committee.

Here's the question. Should the government employees, Senator Douglas, be required to sever all

outside business employment or business interests?

Senator Douglas: Well, I think as a general rule, yes, because if he's carrying on private business on the side, there is always the temptation that he will use his public office to further his private business.

Now the great difficulty with this consists, as Senator Wiley well knows, of the legal profession, and the legal profession can get legal graft and not be caught at it more than any other group than I know, because they can receive fees for other services, ostensibly for other services, but in reality there will be a wink passed that it's in return for favors which these lawyers give as public servants. That's the way the money can be passed legally and no lawyer put in jail.

Mr. Denny: All right. Any other questions, Senator Wiley? We have with us here on the platform tonight, and he's been referred to before, the very genial Republican of the Free State of Maryland, the Honorable Theodore Roosevelt McKeldin, and I'm going to ask him to start the question period.

Governor McKeldin: Thank you very much. I appreciate that applause, particularly because we didn't have the fellows up here to hoop it up as they did for the other.

I'm thoroughly delighted to be here. I am certainly happy to welcome Senator Wiley and Senator Paul Douglas, two great American statesmen, men who are held high in the hearts of the people here in the State of Maryland. These are the type of men we like to see come to Maryland and this is the type that we can follow. Splendid men.

Now I will ask one question, but I want to say I can understand what Senator Douglas meant when he said about one committee giving five, another committee giving another five. We poor Republicans in Maryland, being a hopeless minority group, Senator, we know what it is to have those Democrats get all that money against us, and so we are 100 percent in favor of making a limit to the money, so that minority parties, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, wherever they are, can have a fair shake.

Now I want to say this. I think we've reached an all-time high, or rather I should say an all-time low in the morals of our public officials in America today. "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people. . . . Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it."

Now I want to ask Senator Douglas this question. Senator Douglas, do you believe that the present administration, under which this unprecedented corruption has developed and flourished, can most effectively clean up its own mess, or don't you think they need a change like they had in Philadelphia and that a new broom can do a better job?

Senator Douglas: That's the sort of a question which I would expect a Republican governor to ask. There is no doubt that the Democratic party must assume some responsibility for the abuses which have occurred. We would take the credit for the sunshine, and we must bear some responsibility for the rain. That's perfectly true. I would like to point out, however, that the good governor was a little bit beside the point when he said that this cor-

ruption was unprecedented, because I remember the days of Warren Gamaliel Harding. (*Applause.*) The governor may have been too young to remember Warren Gamaliel Harding, but at that time you may remember that the Secretary of the Interior went to jail for accepting a \$100,000 bribe, the Attorney-General was forced to resign in disgrace and nearly went to jail, the head of the Veterans Administration committed suicide, and the Alien Enemy Property Custodian, Cal Miller of Delaware, went to the Federal Penitentiary. So it's not unprecedented, and I may say that today it seems to be small stuff compared to the Harding era.

I would like to point out if I may that in the main it has been all Democratic Senators and Congressmen who have exposed all of these evils; namely, Senator Hoey, Senator Fulbright, with whom I had the honor to work, Congressman Hardy of Virginia, Congressman King. So far as I know, the only Republican who has been active, and he's been doing a very good job, is Senator Williams of Delaware.

Now about this new broom business. I want to know whether it really is a new broom, who is going to wield it, whether they'll sweep the dirt out of the door or

merely under the rug, and whether what will happen will not be a petty graft such as has happened, but big graft on a huge scale for the fat boys. That's what I would like to know. (*Applause*)

Mr. Denny: Senator Wiley, I believe you wanted to comment on that question.

Senator Wiley: I want to bring to your attention, my good friends, the statement of a great Democrat of former days and see if it isn't applicable as an answer to the question that was asked. Listen.

"For one reason or another, even a wisely led political party, given a long tenure of office, finally fails to express any longer the will of the people; and when it does so fail to express the will of the people, it ceases to be an effective instrument of government. It is far better for such a political party, certainly better for the state, that it should be relegated to the role of critic and that the opposing political party should assume the reins of government. This condition appears to have been arrived at in America." President Roosevelt said that in 1932. I say it's pertinent now, and I want to answer Senator Douglas and say that it was the Republicans who cleaned up that mess, now let the Democrats clean up their mess and they'll have something to shoot at.

★

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: All right, thank you, Senator Wiley. Now it's time we got out into the audience with the questions.

Man: Senator Wiley, what steps has Congress taken to implement the recommendation of the Ke-fauver Committee?

Senator Wiley: Well, I'll have to do a little bit of thinking. We introduced as a result of our recommendations six or seven bills, and insofar as I know the Senate has taken no definite action in relation to any of them. They are still in committee.

Man: Senator Douglas, do you think an Eisenhower victory in 1952 will end corruption in the government?

Senator Douglas: It's well known that I have great personal admiration for General Eisenhower, but we need more than good men in the presidency. We also need a fundamental moral change in the community, and we also need some of these constructive measures which I have suggested.

Man: Senator Wiley, do you think the much publicized fraud and bribery among government officials indicates a real increase in this kind of crime, or is it publicized out of actual proportion?

Senator Wiley: I'm very glad you asked that question. In my humble opinion, and I say it advisedly, while we have possibly 2,200,000 employees in government, I think that the rascals are a very small percentage of one per cent; but just as the termites can get under a building—a very few of them—and start wrecking the institution, so it's our job now, no matter how big or how many they are, or how few there are, to get rid of these termites that are really throwing the mud into our system here.

Lady: Senator Douglas, what percentage of officials proven corrupt were elected?

Senator Douglas: Well, so far as I know, very few of the people who have been found corrupt were chosen by the people. There have

been two or three cases in the House of Representatives. I think that's about all. The majority of cases have not been people appointed by the President, but people appointed by people whom the President has appointed. In other words, they are two or three degrees removed from the President, not first degree removed.

Man: This is directed to Senator Wiley or Senator Douglas. Can we honestly continue to tell our children that crime doesn't pay in the face of present conditions?

Senator Wiley: That's a \$64 question, and my answer is yes. Any man that sells his government short, he's got a spark of conscience in there, and it gnaws at him. I've seen it, and I know what I'm talking about. And the guy who gets his money by being a traitor to his government—and that's what he is—doesn't remain alive very long, nor does he live a very peaceful life. It doesn't pay to sell your government short. *(Applause)*

Mr. Denny: Senator Douglas agrees with that.

Man: Senator Douglas, assuming that public officials accused of accepting mink coats and other gifts are guilty, can they be prosecuted under existing laws?

Senator Douglas: I rather doubt it, because the connection cannot be proved between the gift received and the act performed. It will always be claimed that the gift is disassociated from the act

of the official; therefore, I do not think these acts can be punished under the criminal laws. That is why I propose that we make them improper. They are not at present illegal, but they are improper, and I would punish the impropriety by dismissal from public office.

Lady: To Senator Douglas. Should a public official who has a position of trust, whose duty it is to enforce laws, suffer the more severe punishment for accepting a bribe than the man who offers that bribe?

Senator Douglas: Well, in my view they are equally guilty. I think it was a great abuse of justice when Secretary Fall was convicted of receiving a \$100,000 bribe from Mr. Doheny, but Mr. Doheny was acquitted of giving the \$100,000 bribe. That was an abuse of justice.

Man: This question is directed to Senator Wiley or Senator Douglas. Is there any marked difference in corruption in local government where city managers have replaced politically elected mayors?

Senator Wiley: I would say that depends entirely upon the personage of the manager, of the individual. It goes down to that. Is he a man of character. Is he a man of integrity? I think it was Thomas Jefferson, a good Democrat, who said something to the effect that government, the art of government, is the art of being honest. And that's all there is in

city government or in federal government. It's to get men of integrity, character and honesty to do the job.

Mr. Denny: I think he wanted to know, have they got any figures about that to show that government is more efficient, or better run under the city manager plan than the mayor? Are there any statistics?

Senator Wiley: There may be; I have none.

Mr. Denny: Senator Douglas, do you have any, or do you know anything about it?

Senator Douglas: Well, I once served as an alderman on a city council, and my general observation is that graft is diminished with the city manager plan; but it is not necessarily eliminated. When Kansas City was at its most corrupt, they operated under a city manager.

Man: Senator Douglas, although this question has been touched on before this evening, perhaps you could give us a definite clear-cut answer yes or no. If the power to extend patronage were removed from the elected officials to the greatest degree possible, would corruption be appreciably decreased?

Senator Douglas: The question is whether civil service wouldn't eliminate corruption. Well, I would like to point out that in the case of the Internal Revenue Bureau, most of the men who have been guilty, apparently, of cor-

ruption, were civil service employees. Civil service is not an infallible remedy. It may reduce corruption in certain lines, but I don't think we should go overboard in a universal endorsement of civil service for all positions.

Man: Senator Wiley, Supreme Court Justice Jackson recently made the following statement: "Men are more often bribed by their prejudices and their ambitions than by money." What can be done about this aspect of political corruption?

Senator Wiley: By prejudices instead by money? Well, I suppose that the average human being is fallible, but if he gets the right kind of training in the home, in the school, and he becomes a public official, like the judge, if he has prejudice he isn't going to handle the matter; if he's a good judge, he's going to leave it go. So I think the thing to do is to inculcate that concept into the mind of every public servant that it's his job to handle the matter without prejudice, without favor, and with integrity.

Man: Senator Douglas, do you think we can interest enough dollar-a-year men to fill key positions in government who will frown on freezer and mink coat handouts?

Senator Douglas: Well, I'm not certain that that's the remedy at all, to get one-dollar-a-year men. Sometimes the dollar-a-year men expose themselves to the temptation of favoring the concerns that

are paying their salaries. I would say we need higher salaries for public officials, so that public service can be made a permanent career, and we should hold them responsible; but we shouldn't depend upon volunteers permanently manning the public service.

Man: Senator Wiley, do you think the adoption of the Hoover Report will tend to decrease or stop corruption in government? Are you in favor of this adoption?

Senator Wiley: Well, I'm in favor of practically all of the Hoover recommendations. We've already had about 50 per cent of them, and as far as I know, there has been practically no saving. Whether or not it will affect corruption depends entirely first, on the character of the administrator who is handling the job, and upon the people themselves who expect favors—what they're going to do to attempt to bribe government. It's a question again of honesty in the people who are in the transaction.

Man: Senator Douglas, why hasn't President Truman appointed a non-partisan commission to deal with the scandals in government?

Senator Douglas: Well, I don't know. I think he has had some difficulty in dealing in getting the proper personnel. Now I may say that the law in this matter is not certain. I'm not at all certain that the President has the power of subpoena and citation for con-

tempt. I think he does not, and therefore cannot delegate it to any group. It's possible that if he set up two men as assistant attorney-generals that they might have this power, but otherwise I think it would be very difficult for the President, in the absence of congressional action, to give this power.

Man: Senator Wiley, this being a year of election, I would like to ask this question. What can the Republican party do more if they win the election than the Democrats?

Senator Wiley: Throw the rascals out.

Man: Senator Douglas, are the recent disclosures of corruption in Washington relatively trivial compared to the billions congress voted to special interests in the guise of depletion allowances, etc?

Senator Douglas: That's a very good question. A lot of perfectly respectable people who don't pass money get legislation to favor special interests and take hundreds of millions, and in some cases billions of dollars, out of the public purse. It reminds me of a medieval English verse that I should like to repeat: "The law locks up the man or woman who steals the goose off the common, but lets the greater felon loose who steals the common from the goose."
(Applause)

Man: I have a question for Sen-

ator Wiley. Senator Wiley, the problem of corruption is an old one. Could you tell us what the Republican party has done prior to the present exposé to clear up this problem of corruption?

Senator Wiley: Well, if I understand your question, it implies what has the Republican party been able to do in the last 20 years the Democrats have been in power creating this corruption. Well, I suppose the answer is that we've been trying to expose or get out the criminal boils, in view of the fact that when I came to the Senate back in '39 there were only some 15 Republicans with very little or no power. I think that there are some very fine Democrats and some very fine Republicans who are interested in cleaning the house, and that's what we hope will be done; but I again say to you as was said from the floor, that it's the job of the administration in power to clean the house just like Coolidge did when Fall and the rest of them went haywire.

Mr. Denny: Thank you Senator Wiley and Senator Douglas. It seems that you both agree that the thing to do is throw the rascals out of either party if they are found corrupt, and you generally agree that what we need is more character and integrity on the part of the people in office as well as the American people.

THE LISTENER TALKS BACK

"WILL LIFE BE BETTER IN '52?"

Program of January 1, 1952

Speakers

Frederick Willkie
Louis Bromfield

Michael V. DiSalle
Houston Peterson

Each week we print as many significant comments on the preceding Tuesday's broadcast as space allows. You are invited to send in your opinions, pro and con. The letters should be mailed to Department A, Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y., not later than Thursday following the program. It is understood that we may publish any letters or comments received.

DARKEST HOUR, GREATEST HOPE

From a factual viewpoint we would say this is our darkest hour yet—the Korean war which goes on endlessly with no hope of winning or stopping . . . until we may become as France is today, ineffectual because depleted of her young men; the growing inflation brought on by Government extravagance until we are on the brink of bankruptcy; Communists in our midst and in the Government . . . corruption everywhere in high places, socialism increasing here.

Yet in reality, there is more hope now than a year ago! The sleeping giant that was America is now slowly stirring and gradually waking to the dangers of Communism and socialism at home and abroad. Soon the country may be fully aroused and realize that

we have been going down the wrong road. The giant may shake itself and go into action this election year. . . .

We should thank our stars that this is an election year and that all have the opportunity to get several fresh horses before we cross any more streams.—I. C. VIOLET, Kansas City, Kansas.

OPTIMIST

I know I'm going to have a good 1952. I intend to work for it and live for it, and a few downs aren't going to stop me from having ups.—MRS. B. R. RYDBOM, Rockford, Illinois.

LET TIME TELL

From the beginning of this Nation up to present we have those who have been prophesying calamity and with it all, we are going forward. In my judgment the finest

chapter in the American record is what has taken place in the last few years—a record of which we can be proud. How we could expect to go through two devastating wars and now a rearmament program without having its effect upon our own standards is beyond me. And to be able to have butter and cannon at the same time is something for which we can all be grateful and proud. But of course . . . when we have those who feel discouraged, there is only one thing to do and that is to say "Let time tell." — ARMAND MAY, Atlanta, Georgia.

SHARE A BETTER '52

I think Mr. Willkie, who proposed that we share our industrial

know-how with the people who don't have it, expressed the most important thought of the evening. When we keep it and become unnecessarily rich and powerful we just have to give it out as charity, which is bad for the receivers and makes us feel unjustly treated too. So why not let them learn from us and become self-supporting and keep their self-respect while they are doing it? The world cannot forever exist half slave and half free and the sooner we share our industrial experience the sooner will backward people gain the power to throw off the tyranny (which) now keeps them in slavery. — MRS. A. C. POTTER, Phoenix, Arizona.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 16

50. Does Modern Art Make Sense?
51. How Can We Win the War of Ideas?

VOLUME 17

8. What Is the United States' and Europe's Best Defense Against Communism?
9. Is the West Finished in Asia?
10. Is Our Security Endangered by Congressional Hearings?
11. How Can We Stop Making Drug Addicts of Our Children?
12. What Will the Korean Truce Mean?
13. What's Wrong With British-American Relations?
14. Can Asia Be Saved from Communist Imperialism?
15. What Kind of World Does World Youth Want?
16. How Will Further Defense Production Affect Your Standard of Living?
17. Are We Governed by Lobbies?
18. Who Will Pay for the Increased Taxes?
19. What's Wrong With College Football?

20. Can Legislation Cure Segregation in Housing?
21. Will Industrial Japan Dominate Asia's Markets?
22. Western Germany's Place in Europe.
23. McCarthyism: Good or Bad?
24. Is the Welfare State Fair to All?
25. Is American Youth Accepting Responsibility?
26. How Will the Truman Administration Look to History?
27. Who Can Win in 1952?
28. Are We Teaching People To Think?
29. The Crisis in American Education.
30. Europe and America—Partners or Rivals?
31. Are We Close To Solving Our Race Problem?
32. Are Our Protestant Churches Reaching the Hearts and Minds of Men?
33. How Can British and America Reconcile Their Differences?
34. Is This a Man's World?
35. How Can We Get from January to December?
36. Will Life Be Better in 1952?

Order single copies at 15c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
Town Hall, New York 36, N. Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will Be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate:.....

26 Weeks for Only
\$3.00
Single Copies 15c